

REMARKS

Upon entry of this paper, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 23 and 24 will be pending in the above identified application. It is respectfully submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the Office action mailed on September 15, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by *Robotham* (U.S. 2002/001542).

Applicants disagree with the Office Action's characterization of the cited reference and pending claim language and request reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

Anticipation requires the presence of every limitation in a single prior art reference.

However, *Robotham* does not disclose every limitation of claims 1, 6, and 9. For example, claims 1, 6, and 9 were previously amended to clarify that identification information (*e.g.*, version information) is related with the symbol image data. The mobile phone terminal, for example, stores the identification information of the symbol image data stored in the mobile phone terminal and requests the server to transmit server-side image data identification information prior to request to transmit the symbol image data, and then discriminates whether or not the symbol image data stored in the mobile phone terminal is the latest data. If it is not the latest data, the mobile phone terminal requests the server to transmit the latest symbol image data.

Also, in the image data transmitting/receiving system of the present invention, for example, the symbol image data stored in the terminal-side symbol image data memory is discriminated whether or not it is the latest data. Only when the symbol image data stored in the server-side symbol image data memory is renewed and thereby the terminal-side symbol image data is not the latest data, the symbol image data is transmitted to the mobile phone terminal from the server.

Thus, in comparison with a case that the symbol image data are transmitted every time without discriminating whether or not it is the latest data, the construction in the above claims can reduce transmitting/receiving data volume between the mobile phone terminal and the server, and thereby reduce communication costs and prevent congestion in communication circuits. Further, as it is possible to discriminate whether or not the symbol image data is the latest data in the terminal side, it is also possible to reduce the load on the server.

Also, *Robotham* describes that client 24 receives a multi-level set of bitmaps 14 from server 22. The client 24 generates a multi-level set of client display surfaces 26a-26n that correspond to the multi-level set of bitmaps 14 sent by the server 22. The client 24 may process user interface actions associated with its viewport 16 and determine the particular client display surface 26 that will be displayed.

Unlike the presently claimed invention, the client 24 does not include an identification information transmission request information transmitter that transmits server-side image data identification information transmission requests for the server to transmit server-side image data

identification information comprising identification information of the symbol image data stored in the server, before creating images displayed on the information display screen.

Also, *Robotham* does not include a symbol image data transmission request information transmitter that transmits symbol image data transmission requests for the transmission of symbol image data stored in the server and the resolution related information to the server. Instead, *Robotham* discloses that “the pixel transforms performed at the server 22 can optionally use the expected client (terminal) display pixel resolution and aspect ratio as input parameters in order to generate display-ready data for the client.” In other words, there is no discussion of the client 24 providing resolution related information to the server in order to reduce the load on the server. *See, e.g.*, paragraphs [0066]-[0069].

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 23 and 24 are not anticipated by *Robotham*.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Petchatnikov* (U.S. 2004/0030493) and *Robotham* (U.S. 2002/001542).

Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and is allowable over the cited references in view of the remarks above distinguishing claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned remarks, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/DARRIN A. AUITO/

Darrin A. Auito
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 56,024
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

DAA/rse